



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,667	10/24/2003	Jeffrey Dean Black	600189.092	9634
61834	7590	06/20/2007		
DREIER LLP 499 PARK AVE NEW YORK, NY 10022			EXAMINER CHEN, TE Y	
			ART UNIT 2161	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/693,667	Applicant(s) BLACK ET AL.	
	Examiner Susan Y. Chen	Art Unit 2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 23, 2007 has been entered.

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on examination April 23, 2007.

Claims 4-21 are pending for examination. Claims 4 and 6 have been canceled, claims 4 and 8-10 have been amended.

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on April 23, 2007 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,813 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13-14 and 16-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,008 issued to Pogrebisky et al. (hereinafter referred as Pogrebisky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624 issued to Teare et al. (hereinafter referred as Teare).

Claim 4:

Pogrebisky discloses a system for providing a user with at least one response to a search query of the Internet [e.g., Abstract, the Astra system as shown in Fig(s) 1, 19-20, etc.], the system comprising:

a user interface, the user interface effective to receive a search query from a user [e.g., col. 2, lines 18-23];

a web page record database connected to the user interface, the web page record database including a plurality of web page records, the plurality of web page

Art Unit: 2161

records including a response to the search query [e.g., col. 3, lines 31-43, Fig. 4 and associated texts];

a search engine module connected to both the user interface and the web page record database, the search engine module effective to search the web page record database for the response [e.g., the use of web crawling via Internet search engine at col. 7, lines 9 –16 & 23-31& Fig(s) 7, 13-15];

an entity information database including information about individuals or organizations [e.g., Web site database at col. 5, lines 66 – col. 6, line 38]; and

a mapping database connected to the web page record database and the entity information database, the mapping database including information for mapping the records with respective individuals or organizations [e.g., col. 2, lines 27-57, the use of “Astra” software mapping technique at col. 7, lines 47 – col. 8, line 7].

Pogrebisky did not expressly details that the entity information database maintains ownership over one or more web page records.

However, Teare, discloses an entity information database maintains ownership over one or more web page records [e.g., Abstract, Fig.(s) 2A-2B, 3, 9-10 and associated texts].

Pogrebisky and Teare are both in the same endeavor to facilitate the mapping of internet resource including Web pages via a common domain name service performed by web crawling [e.g., Pogrebisky: col. 8, lines 30 – 33; Teare: Fig. 3 and associated texts], hence, with the teachings of Pogrebisky and Teare in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was

Art Unit: 2161

made to apply the ownership maintenance details of an entity information database as disclosed by Teare into Pogrebisky's system, because by doing so, the combined invention will provide a flexible, simple way to associate the ownership with a set of web pages, and thereby maintains ownership over one or more web page records.

Claim 6:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the entity information database includes geographic information about the individuals or organizations [e.g., Pogrebisky: Abstract, lines 4-6; Fig. 4 and associated texts].

Claim 8:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the mapping database maps a particular individual or organizations to a plurality of records [e.g., Pogrebisky: Fig. 4 and associated texts].

Claim 10:

Pogrebisky discloses a method for providing a user at least one response to a search query of the Internet [e.g., Pogrebisky: Fig. 1 and associated texts], the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2161

receiving a search query from a user [e.g., Pogrebisky: the user interface at col. 2, lines 18-23];

searching a web page record database for a response to the search query [e.g., Pogrebisky :the use of web crowing via Internet search engine at col. 7, lines 9 –16 & 23-31& Fig(s) 7, 13-15];

mapping the response to an individual or organization associated with the response [e.g., Pogrebisky: col. 2, lines 27-57, the use of “Astra” software mapping technique at col. 7, lines 47 – col. 8, line 7]; and

displaying the response and a name of the individual or organization to the user [Pogrebisky : col. 15, lines 27-59; Fig.(s) 1 and 4-6].

Pogrebisky did not expressly discloses that the individual or organization maintains ownership over one or more web page records.

However, Teare, discloses an entity information database maintains ownership over one or more web page records [e.g., Abstract, Fig.(s) 2A-2B, 3, 9-10 and associated texts].

Pogrebisky and Teare are both in the same endeavor to facilitate the mapping of internet resource including Web pages via a common domain name service performed by web crawling [e.g., Pogrebisky: col. 8, lines 30 – 33; Teare: Fig. 3 and associated texts], hence, with the teachings of Pogrebisky and Teare in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the ownership maintenance details of an entity information database as disclosed by Teare into Pogrebisky's system, because by doing so, the combined

Art Unit: 2161

invention will provide a flexible, simple way to associate the ownership with a set of web pages, and thereby maintains ownership over one or more web page records.

Claim 11:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 10, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the search query is based on a hierarchical category structure [e.g. Pogrebisky: col. 2, lines 27-48; Fig. 6].

Claim 13:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 10, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the method comprising displaying geographic information about the entity [e.g., Pogrebisky: Abstract, lines 4-6; Fig. 4 and associated texts].

Claim 14:

Pogrebisky discloses a method for providing a user with at least one response to a search query of the Internet [e.g., Abstract, Fig. 1], the method comprising: receiving a search query from a user in the form of category selection [e.g., the use of user interface at col. 2, lines 18-23];

determining at least one individual or organization associated with the search query [the creation of Web site map by the Astra GUI navigation tools, col. 9, lines 60 – col. 10, line 67; Fig. 1 and associated texts];

displaying the URL to the user [e.g., the use of Visual Web Display technique at col. 10, lines 54-57; Fig(s) 1-3].

Pogrebisky did not expressly disclose that determining at least one URL under the ownership of the individual or organization [e.g., the use of URL menu at col. 15, lines 40-44].

However, Teare, discloses an entity information database maintains ownership over one or more web page records [e.g., Abstract, Fig.(s) 2A-2B, 3, 9-10 and associated texts].

Pogrebisky and Teare are both in the same endeavor to facilitate the mapping of internet resource including Web pages via a common domain name service performed by web crawling [e.g., Pogrebisky: col. 8, lines 30 – 33; Teare: Fig. 3 and associated texts], hence, with the teachings of Pogrebisky and Teare in front of him/her, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the ownership maintenance details of an entity information database as disclosed by Teare into Pogrebisky's system, because by doing so, the combined invention will provide a flexible, simple way to associate the ownership with a set of web pages, and thereby maintains ownership over one or more web page records.

Claim 16:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the category selection comes from a hierarchical category structure [e.g. Pogrebisky: col. 2, lines 27-48; Fig. 6].

Claim 17:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the search query includes geographic criteria and the method further comprises filtering the at least one URL based on the geographic criteria before performing the displaying [e.g., Pogrebisky : the filtering bar (47, Fig. 1) at col. 16, line 8-26 & col. 26, VIII section].

Claim 18:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses that the geographic criteria is a city [e.g., Pogrebisky: col. 19, lines 29-33].

Claim 19:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses the at least one URL includes a plurality of URLs and the plurality of URLs are displayed to the user in an order of popularity [Pogrebisky: col. 3, lines 9-30].

Claim 20:

Art Unit: 2161

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses displaying a name of the individual or organization [e.g., Pogrebisky: Fig. 4 and associated texts].

Claim 21:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 14, the combined invention of Pogrebisky and Teare further discloses displaying a plurality of URLs and the method further comprises enabling the user to execute a search in only the plurality of URLs [e.g., Pogrebisky: the use of clicks on URL icon, at col. 10, lines 20-30 and Fig. 3].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103 (continue)

Claims 5, 7, 9, 12 and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,008 issued to Pogrebisky et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,624, issued to Teare et al. (herein after referred as Teare).

Claim 5:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, Pogrebisky does not specifically disclose that the mapping database uses American Business Information Numbers. However, as admitted by Applicant's specification that the American Business Information Numbers is sponsored by info USA [e.g., Page 6, line 3], thus, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2161

to apply the widely used existing American Business Information Numbers into the claimed mapping database, because by doing so, the claimed database will be allowed to map the unique American Business Information Numbers to any American business without reinventing the wheel.

Claim 7:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, Pogrebisky does not specifically disclose that the entity information database uses Standard Industry Code (SIC) fields. However, as admitted by Applicant's specification that the claimed Industry Code is a Standard. Therefore, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the well-known SIC field in the claimed database, because by doing so, the claimed database will be upgraded to apply the SIC field for classifying the industry and still binding to the desired standard.

Claim 9:

In addition to the limitations recited in claim 4, Pogrebisky does not specifically disclose that the entity information database includes one or more companies and their financial profile information.

However, Teare discloses the entity information database includes one or more companies and their financial profile information [e.g., Abstract, Fig. 7A and associated texts].

Art Unit: 2161

Pogrebisky and Teare are both in the same endeavor to optimize Web page query processing via Internet databases, as such, it would have been obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to include the claimed one of more companies and their financial profile information as the entities of the well-known Web-site database, because by doing so, the claimed entity database will be promoted to support the manipulation of global business and financial entities as desired by users.

Claim 12:

This claim recites similar subject matters as claim 5 in form of method, hence, is rejected for the same reason.

Claim 15:

This claim recites similar subject matters as claim 7 in form of method, hence, is rejected for the same reason.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g., 35 U.S.C. 1112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y. Chen whose telephone number is 571-272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2161



June 15, 2007